

## REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims of the present application are respectfully requested.

In the present Office Action, Claim 7 is rejected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter the applicants regard as the invention. In particular, Claim 7 does not include a unit for the punch through doping pocket concentration.

In response to the indefiniteness rejection, applicants have amended Claim 7 so as to properly identify the doping concentration as having the units “atoms/cm<sup>3</sup>”.

Applicants submit that the units for doping concentration are well known to those skilled in the art. Indeed, U.S. Patent No. 5,731,609 to Hamamoto, et al., which is applied in the present Office Action, confirms that the above units for doping concentration are proper. See, Col. 5, lines 20-28 of Hamamoto, et al.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the indefiniteness rejection of Claim 7 has been obviated. Applicants thus request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection.

Claims 1-6, 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,731,609 to Hamamoto, et al. (“Hamamoto, et al.”). Applicants observe that Claims 10 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 12-20 are withdrawn.

In view of the indicated allowability of dependent Claim 11, applicants have amended Claim 1 by incorporating the features from dependent Claims 8 and 11 therein. The inclusion of these features into Claim 1 makes Claims 8 and 11 redundant; therefore applicants have cancelled those claims herein. In addition, the cancellation of Claim 8 necessitated the amendments made to Claims 9 and 10.

Applicants submit that since amended Claim 1 now includes subject matter deemed allowable in the present Office Action, i.e., the feature that the bitlines and wordlines are isolated from each other, the anticipation rejection is moot and is no longer applicable. Specifically, Hamamot, et al. do not disclose the structure recited in amended Claim 1 which includes bitlines atop wordlines, wherein the bitlines and wordlines are isolated from each other.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the anticipation rejection citing Hamamoto, et al. has been obviated. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection citing Hamamoto, et al. are respectfully requested. Since the above amendments obviate the anticipation rejection, applicants submit that Claims 1-7, 9 and 10 are now allowable.

Thus, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is firmly believed that the present case is in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Leslie S. Sziyos, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 39,394

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER  
400 Garden Cit Plaza  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343  
LSS/sf